

**MINUTES**  
**REGIONAL TRANSMISSION COORDINATION TASK FORCE**

**November 25, 2024**  
**2:30 P.M.**

**Microsoft Teams**

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 220 034 722 87

Passcode: BHQDru

**Dial in by phone**

[+1 775-321-6111,,818011256#](tel:+17753216111818011256) United States, Reno

Phone conference ID: 818 011 256#

- 1. Call to order, roll call, and establishment of quorum.** Jennifer Taylor, Chairwoman, opened the meeting at 2:32 p.m.

**Task Force Members Present**

Jennifer Taylor	Ernest Figueroa
Dwayne McClinton	John Henry Shields
Richard Perkins	Erik Hansen
Jeremy Newman	Alise Porto
Luis Cruz	Nicole Ting
Elizabeth Becker	Leslie Mujica
Eric Witkoski	Luke Papez
Asm. Daniele Monroe-Moreno	

**Task Force Members Absent**

Carolyn Turner	Tom Burns
Jeremy Drew	Sen. Dallas Harris
Asm. Melissa Hardy	Sen. Pete Goicoechea
Kayla Dowty	Hayley Williamson

- 2. Public comments and discussion.** Chairman Taylor opened this agenda item. There were no public comments.

- 3. Opening Remarks from Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor**

I would like to say thanks to everybody for all the time they spent last week on this meeting for all the good suggestions during the meeting and for the engagement that we got from folks. After the meeting to get this third version of the report put together and also want to say thanks to Director McClinton's awesome Team, Lisa and Lezlie for all the work they did. Getting comments and suggested changes integrated into this version three to make sure we would have a quorum today and for just all of their fantastic coordination. I will move on to approval or oppose of the October 28, 2024 minutes. Those were all emailed to everybody on November 18<sup>th</sup>. Is there anybody who has any comments, questions or concerns about the content of those minutes?

**Leslie Mujica:** Motion to approve; Leslie Mujica for the record.

**Elizabeth Becker:** Second from Elizabeth Becker.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Great, October minutes approved. Let's discuss the report. Everyone's changes and edits have been implemented but with a couple of late changes. Ms. Becker suggested adding in an explanation as to why we did not have two meetings in 2023. That is in the footnote. Then we had some changes in the content of the summaries from Mr. Witkoski. The first one is under the meeting of the regional task meeting of the Task Force from October 28<sup>th</sup>. In the first paragraph, we have added the links to the presentations. Where Eric's first changes were on page 5, he capitalized grid enhancing technologies. The next change is down on page six. Second to last paragraph. On all of the 704B, we had lower case B. Eric changed it to capital B. Anything else from Eric that I'm missing?

**Eric Witkoski:** I think that's it. You've added the link to the statute, which I think is good.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** We added, per your suggestion, an appendix addition, which was great. Let's talk about recommendations really quickly. No, we didn't have public comment, but I believe David Ruben is on from NV Energy. Nicole, is it appropriate to have Mr. Rubin weigh in at this point, even though he's not technically on the task force but NV Energy does have a statutory seat on the task force.

**Nicole Ting:** Yes, sure. You can hear from anyone you wish.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Fantastic. Then I wish to hear from Mr. Rubin. Let's walk through the recommendations and if you have specific concerns, changes, whatever, please let us know. Otherwise, if the utility doesn't have any concern, just flag that for us as well. We didn't have any suggested changes to the first bullet point from last week so I will take that as approval for that bullet point unless Mr. Rubin tells me otherwise.

**David Rubin:** I think you're good to go.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Perfect. Thank you. On the second bullet point, the only change to this one was adding in Sagebrush Ecosystem Council, along with the language about relevant state and local agencies. I'll open it up for anyone to discuss concerns, changes or other comments about that second bullet point. The third bullet point is CREPC was spelled out but not abbreviated. The only other change to that third bullet point is the last bullet that we discussed at the meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> about any other initiatives that might be developed and related to transmission in markets. Just in case something else crops up, I want to make sure that everybody knows our recommendation is to support those continued efforts to have the PUC and GOE at the table for those questions, concerns, comments about that third bullet point. The fourth bullet point was the language about Nevada legislators making sure that the state's interests are represented in relevant subcommittees at NCSL and CSG, and in any other legislative initiatives. Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno, given that you're on the phone, we would just love to have you make sure that language sounds correct for those two bodies that I didn't misstate how the language should be used to identify those two subcommittees and the two legislative bodies.

**Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:** That is fine. I read through it and the language is fine. Thank you.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Thank you. The next bullet point related to GOED, this language was also developed during our meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> and did not receive any comments, especially from GOED that the language was not correct or needed any type of tweaking. We did have one change related to enhancing data availability and to energy needs that would be provided to the PUCN but without violating privacy concerns of entities considering engaging in Nevada's regional development to allow better understanding of the business and industries that could locate in the state. That language about business and industries that could locate in the state is specific as cited from Senate Bill 448, Section 33, Sub one, Sub E, so that language would go in as part of that overall bullet about GOED. The next bullet point, which is a specific policy recommendation, Nevada should enact/support policies that result in greater use of GETs in advanced conductors as a means of increasing capacity on the existing transmission system. The only change suggested I heard was that enact/support be deleted and replaced with "consider".

We heard from Julia Selker about FERC Order 1920 is directing regional planning around transmission to look at the use of GETs and I think that leaving the language as enact/support is appropriate because it's something that is set out in the FERC Order and would ensure that Nevada is moving forward with appropriate policies for innovation on our transmission systems, and especially as we're looking at the length of time to develop our transmission infrastructure. I think that having an emphatic sort of recommendation about GETs policies is beneficial for the state and beneficial for us to be able to increase capacity while we're still looking at build out. I will open it up to anybody else.

**Leslie Mujica:** Madam Chair, this is Leslie Mujica for the record. I'm in full support of the statement you just made regarding GETs. I think we need to start putting some action behind these items instead of just considering them.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Thank you, Ms. Mujica. Anyone else?

**Eric Witkoski:** Madam Chair, this is Eric Witkoski. Where does the analysis happen? When you say enact, does that mean the legislature's going to pass something and they're going to implement it without any cost benefit analysis? I'm just trying to understand the purpose of the enact or were there some analysis of before money spent?

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** This is the recommendation. First, we need a bill sponsor to bring forward some policy. I imagine that NV Energy would want to have some type of lead in anything that would impact their transmission lines. I think that would have to come out through discussions on a bill. Again, this is just a set of recommendations.

**Ernest Figueroa:** To follow up on that comment, even though I'm not a voting member for any of these recommendations, I would be more comfortable with the word support. There's a lot of issues surrounding advanced conductors and what our current infrastructure is like. I think there needs to be some analysis done and an evaluation of the pros and cons before we go all out.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Even though you are not a voting member, you are a critical piece of the discussion. Anybody else? I guess my concern is again, I see what you're saying, Eric and Ernest, we don't have a bill in front of us. Again, I think the thought was that because it is a directive and a piece of FERC Order 1920 that it's worth pushing the verb a little bit stronger than just support. But that's why I put enact/support.

**Eric Witkoski:** I could go with support, but enact, I'm a little uncomfortable with it. If there was a legislation passed that it says they enact without any of the Commission reviewing or any analysis, I think we could support it but in that it's a little worrisome.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** I feel like support sits somewhere between consider and enact. Does anybody have any concerns about stating support and deleting enact but leaving support? Lisa, why don't you go ahead and strike enact and we'll leave support. Then we will leave it to advocates to bring some great language forward to folks like the Assemblywoman for a broader discussion. The bullet point about statewide transmission plan building on the 2012 Transmission Initiative routing study, I had a comment in here. Lisa, you guys will add that 2012 NIAC study to the resource tab, correct? If you haven't already. Which you probably have.

**Lisa Fredley:** Yes, I'm positive that I added it at the very end.

**Eric Witkoski:** Madam Chair, this is Eric. On that one, somebody might want to give a quick summary of what that is for those that may not be familiar with it.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** It was basically a transmission study from 2012 that looked at transmission corridors. It was called an Initiative to Export Nevada's Renewable Energy and it was done in a collaborative effort by a group of consultants. It covered an analysis of export opportunities, some preferred projects in different regions of the state. They talked about contingent project scenarios, project costs and ratings, a market export opportunity, a group of electric grid evaluation analysis and some routing approaches, designing concepts. Some of the conclusions would be things like outreach and coordination with regional and proposed interstate transmission projects. Discussion of potential benefits to Nevada and the business case. This would lead into something that we talked about in a further bullet point about the economic opportunities around transmission and being part of a regional transmission organization. Federal and regional transmission monitoring discussions with California utilities, project financing and environmental application preparation. Given that this is 12 years old and the vast changes that have happened since then from a policy perspective and a market perspective, this is something that has been kind of discussed as an opportunity.

The change that I requested on this was the language is written from the first version that we discussed, but then this was in the second version. Nobody made comments on it, but to put it at the top of this discussion, we added where it is building on the 2012 transmission initiative routing study and consider partnerships with regional ISOs and RTOs or reliability planning organizations to share the costs of the updated studies development. You heard from the folks at WestTech at CAISO that there is work being done and that Nevada already has a seat at the table. I think in partnership with some of those entities, we could come up with a new transmission initiative routing study. I would request that language be added in terms of the partnership possibilities. The next bullet point was in the interim, one of the things would be to take a look at other states' transmission citing authorities. We talked about this in the meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup>. We had no requested changes to that during the meeting or in version two or three.

The next bullet point is NV Energy will, to the extent possible, provide quarterly updates regarding Greenlink. This was something that we discussed during the meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> and was requested by certain task force members. We had a discussion with Tony Sanchez on the phone. There are limitations to what NV Energy can provide, and I think that the task force understands that. There were some concerns about subscription availability on the lines, NV Energy was willing to provide a

quarterly overview to the extent that they're able to. There was a request from version two from Carolyn Turner to strike this. She stated it is not a recommendation. I think that given that the task force had a specific interest in having this information provided that it should stay in, but I will wait to hear what everybody else has to say.

**Leslie Mujica:** Madam Chair, this is Leslie Mujica. I am in support for it staying the way it is, but we need to make sure that the words to the extent that they are able are left in.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Yes absolutely. It's in there and it won't change. From what I understood from Mr. Sanchez, they have limitations and so we want to respect that.

**Eric Witkoski:** I'm kind of an information nerd, so I like it.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Any other comments on that? Nevada Task Force should explore alternative methods and opportunities for financing transmission for future projects. We didn't have any comments on this. During the meeting last week, no comments were to be added to version two or requested in version three. The next one is the Nevada Task Force should in the interim explore the economic benefits of joining a western market. Some of this language is directly from the statute, so this first sub bullet, potential areas where growth and demand for electricity or renewable energy generation would be accommodated by additional transmission or RTO opportunities. That is language directly from the statute businesses and industries that could locate in the state. As a result of Nevada's position in an RTO that is also directly from the statute.

The third sub bullet is about small-scale generators and demand response aggregators being put into some of the costs and benefits of those assets being part of a market. If you look at the notes, you'll see my final suggested updates for those two concepts are in the comment where it says, per Jennifer Taylor, November 20, 2024 final suggested updates to this section so it would split out small-scale customer-owned resources, including aggregators, into a centralized wholesale market and secondarily potential for demand response aggregators to bid into a centralized wholesale market. This is just a recommendation about what we want to talk about. In the interim, it is not saying anything has to happen. It's not saying that we are approving any of these types of resources going into a potential market. All we're doing is looking at it, which is what we're tasked to do. In one of the second iteration, there was a request to delete the language about demand response aggregators. The important part of wholesale markets, PJM, has some capacity shortfalls that they're looking at for upcoming seasons. They made an incredible rate hike on the value of demand response for the upcoming auction. The Alberta wholesale market utilizes demand response on a regular basis to stabilize its grid. I think it's an important piece to look at. It's also important to know that these are things that can already be done and are being investigated. On a small-scale customer-owned resource piece is being investigated by CAISO. All these two recommendations do is just continue to have information gathered for our analysis of what are the best options for a market for Nevada.

This is also where that third add on from Jeremy Newman came in. He requested that we add as another sub bullet that says the central role the utility plays in planning for an integrating distributed energy resources for system needs. The other thing that I asked to be added in after our meeting and went in as part of version two was this language about revenue, including but not limited to, property tax revenue for our counties. Finally, we had this language that was looked at in the 2022 report and identified issues and ideas from that. For example, the desired governance principles for market offerings; we know that's a key point of the discussion and we need to keep having it. The suggestion from Eric Witkoski about putting in the language for the bill and the link for the bill, which I thought

was good. We have Appendix B, which is essentially another resource appendix for items that have been referenced during presentations.

**Ernest Figueroa:** Going back to Appendix A, there's just a little typo under Regional Transmission Coordination Task Force.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Thank you so much. Lisa, do you see that? We will do one last comb through for any other typos, punctuation, that kind of thing before it gets submitted.

**Lisa Fredley:** Yes, I will correct it. I did add the NEAC Review report.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Great, if you can add that also on the sidebar tab on the page for the GOE website.

**Eric Witkoski:** Madam Chair, this is Eric. I just want to acknowledge your work on this. We really appreciate you and your team pulling this together and I know it's not easy, but really appreciate you pulling it together and your patience.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Absolutely, thanks to everybody else for their patience and for their time. Thank you for doing two of these meetings. I think it was well worth it to have a robust discussion last time and to be able to bring an iteration with some additional discussion forward. Thank you very much. I appreciate that. And I know Leslie and Lisa do as well, Mr. Figueroa.

**Ernest Figueroa:** I echo Eric's comments and I appreciate you bringing in the excellent speakers, including the pathways initiative summaries and like to thank the staff that worked on the excellent summaries regarding the initiatives. I had no edits there. So thanks again to everybody.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Thank you. I look forward to continuing to have updates from pathways and I appreciate your discussion about the Consumer Advocate piece and making sure that that your colleagues voices are included in the pathways work. I want to check in with Nicole. Is it appropriate then to make a motion to approve the report as discussed today, since there are a couple of edits that we need to pull in from the discussion, is that the appropriate motion?

**Nicole Ting:** I thank you, Chair. What I recommend is a motion to approve the current version of the draft, including all the changes and approvals that were made today.

**Jeremy Newman:** For the record, I make a motion to approve the draft with all edits and changes as presented today.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Yes. Thank you, Mr. Newman.

**Director McClinton:** I second.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** All in favor?

**Jeremy Newman:** I.

**Luke Papez:** I.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Any opposed? We will get this cleaned up and submitted over to the Governor and LCB and all of the Task Force members. I am so appreciative of you guys carving out a second time for this meeting so that we can get through this. Thank you, Ms. Ting, for all your input and guidance.

**Director McClinton:** We are going to clean this up. Send it back out to the body as a whole just for a review? Then send it to the Governor.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** I will leave this question to Ms. Ting.

**Nicole Ting:** No, let's not send it. We're not supposed to deliberate unless we are in here. I recommend making those small edits that were discussed today and send this version out.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** My only thing about sending it out to the task force was we are done. We have approved it with the exception of those small changes that were discussed today.

**Director McClinton:** Correct.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** It would mostly be for everybody's information that they would have the final version, not that it was going back out for further discussion.

**Director McClinton:** Thank you for that clarification. I appreciate it.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** We just want to make sure that we do a final comb through and clean up and make sure there are no more typos. Ms. Ting, if we make a small change that's related to grammar or typo or punctuation, is there an issue with that?

**Nicole Ting:** Yep, not an issue.

4. **Question and Answer:** No questions were asked.
5. **Public comments and discussion:** No public comment was made.
6. **Adjournment:**

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** With that, I make a motion to adjourn.

**Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:** Move to adjourn.

**Eric Witkoski:** Sure.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** We'll have the motion from the Assemblywoman and then the second from Mr. Witkoski. All in favor?

**Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:** I.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor:** Any opposed? No. Fantastic. Thank you. Since we are in Thanksgiving week, I wanted to say how thankful I am for the team at GOE and all their assistance and for all of the collaboration with the Director and with all of you. And for Ms. Ting for all of her

guidance. We'll see you at some point next year. Have a wonderful holiday season and look forward to continuing the conversation in 2025.

**Director McClinton:** Thanks, Jennifer. Have a good one everyone. Thank you.

This notice and agenda have been posted on or before 9:00 a.m. on the third working day before the meeting at the following locations:

- (1) Governor's Office of Energy principal office at 600 E. William St., Ste. 200, Carson City, NV
- (2) Governor's Office of Energy website: <http://energy.nv.gov>
- (3) Nevada State official website: <https://notice.nv.gov>